

The Anti-Slavery Bogle.

MARIUS R. ROBINSON, EDITOR.

VOL. II.—NO. 27.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1856.

ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

WHOLE NO. 541.

The Anti-Slavery Bogle.

DEFERRED ARTICLES.

THE VIRGINIA WAR.

By reference to a short article in our last number, our readers will see that Virginia threatened war upon Pennsylvania in case the latter proceeded to punish a certain kidnapper under indictment at Hollidaysburg. The name of the mischief-maker was Parsons. The Virginia Legislature also proposed to mulct said Parsons in a heavy fine in case he presented himself to the Pennsylvania Court for trial. It will doubtless be some relief to the trembling slaves of the threatened State, to learn that, whatever may be the cost to himself, Parsons presented himself for trial at the appointed time and was acquitted by the Court. Whether the Court acquitted the prisoner to avoid the horrors of the threatened Virginia invasion we do not know. Though we have pretty good evidence to believe that Parsons deserved the fate which for a time seemed to threaten him. We understand that immediately after his discharge from custody he started west, perhaps in search of a more successful opening in his line of business, than that at Hollidaysburg proved to be. For there, though he himself was arrested his intended victim escaped. Let all whose complexion will give this villain any special advantages to be on the lookout.

REWARDED.—J. S. C. Abbott, who has written a defence and eulogy of Napoleon III, which he facetiously calls *History*, has sent a copy of it to the usurper Napoleon III. Mr. Abbott styles the title Napoleon the Washington of France and avows that the history was written under a "sense of his responsibility to God." Of course this pious admiration of one of the greatest human butchers, has received a worthy return from the present Emperor, who has all the craft and wickedness, without the intellectual ability of his predecessor and exemplar. He has accordingly sent an approving letter to Mr. Abbott accompanied with a gold medal. And Mr. Abbott has the weakness to parade this tyrant's approval of his labors, before his countrymen, as an evidence of his literary merit and historic accuracy. With intelligent men this approval must be itself no small condemnation of the work.

DISBANDED.—The Know-Nothings of Georgia county, held a meeting last month and resolved to dissolve all connection with the order. They advise all the subordinate lodges in the county to abandon the organization. They issued an address assigning their reasons for their course in which they say: "We must, as loyal citizens of our common country—boldly, vigilantly, constantly struggle to maintain Freedom—to aid in insupportable and efficiently, the oft repeated assertion of political faith. No more slave States—no more slave Territory! and we feel we cannot do this if we continue members of the American organization. The Philadelphia Convention, we are sorry to confess, far from elucidating and aiding us, will be a low for office, for elucidating influence and votes, as will the Democratic party. The inevitable tendency of the Organization is to be result—that position. In this we hope to be mistaken—but see no good reason why our hope will be changed to fruition."

A QUAKER VICTORY.—Levi Coffin a Friend in Cincinnati, who is Chief Director on the U. G. B. R. of that part of the country, appeared in the U. S. Court Room last week while the fugitive trial was proceeding and stood with his hat on, when says the Gazette:

"A very officious special Marshal, employed for this occasion to assist in preserving order and the Union, regarding this as an insult to the U. S. and to himself as her representative, approached Friend Coffin and demanded imperatively that he should uncover before him and the Commissioner Penderly."

"Friend Coffin explained that he meant no disrespect but it was the custom of his people. It would not do. The brave special Marshal raised his cane and knocked the offending broad brim on the floor. Friend C. paid no attention to that, but remained motionless. In a little while the Marshal returned, picked up the hat and handed it to Levi, who took it and wore it as coolly as the proceedings as though nothing had ever happened to disturb his equanimity."

BORDER RUFFIANISM.—One of the Border Ruffian papers of the last month uttered the following war cry to the savage border men of Missouri:

"The war has again commenced, and the Abolitionists have again commenced it. Pro-Slavery men—law and order men—strike for your rights—strike for your freedom—strike for your altars—avenge the blood of your brethren who have been cowardly assailed, but who have bravely fallen in defence of Southern institutions. Sound the bugle of war over the length and breadth of the land, and leave not an Abolitionist in the Territory to retaliate their treacherous and contaminating deeds—strike your piercing rifle-balls and your glittering steel to their black and villainous hearts. Let the war-cry never cease in Kansas again until our Territory is wrested of the last vestige of Abolitionism."

P. T. BARNUM. has been humbugged out of several hundred thousand dollars by a Yankee clock company.

RICHMOND MARRIED WOMEN.—The New York Legislature has a bill before it which provides that any married woman whose husband, from drunkenness or profligacy, or other cause, shall neglect or refuse to provide for her support or the support of her children, or any married woman who may be deserted by her husband, without any fault on her part, shall have the right to transact business in her own name, collect her own earnings and those of her minor children, and educate her children, free from the interference of her husband or any other person. She may also bind out or hire out her minor children. Also, hereafter it shall be necessary to the validity of every indenture of apprenticeship that the mother, if living with her husband, sign the same. The bill aims at abuses that exist in an alarming extent.

A CONTRADICTION DIRECT.—The laws of Virginia, relating to slavery, are so much, almost, as any humane man could wish. —*Christianity*

It is enacted and declared by this General Assembly. If any slave resist his master, (or by his master's order correcting him,) and by the extremity of the correction should chance to die, (that death shall not be accounted felony, but the master (or other person appointed by the master to punish him) be acquitted from molestation.—*Statutes of Virginia*

We have no comment to offer. In truth, it would be superfluous.—*Leader*

The population of Hamburg and its suburbs is, according to a census just taken, 208,198 souls.

RICHMOND, VA., Feb. 2.—The Southern Commercial Convention met to-day, when Resolutions were adopted, declaring the establishment of a first class line of steamships from Liverpool to some Southern port, and recommending Southern Legislators to use their efforts in accomplishing this end, as soon as possible. At adjournment a resolution was pending declaring that Congress should aid the Southern mail steamships as well as those belonging to the North.

NICHOLAS is said to be going ahead. Walker has a sufficient force under his command to maintain the native citizens in favor of him, and the priests only are opposed to the invasion of civilization and freedom. A great wharf has been completed at Virgin Bay, which enables vessels of every description to discharge their cargoes in regular commercial style.

The friends of Antioch College have received the money necessary to pay the debt which has embarrassed the institution for some time. It is to be hoped that it is now about to commence a long career of useful prosperity.

REV. M. D. CONWAY, pastor of an Unitarian congregation in Washington city, in his sermon last Sunday announced his views on Slavery—which he said was no question of North or South but of conscience and humanity, which know no geographical lines. It is supposed Mr. Conway will lose his pastorate, for this bold avowal of antislavery sentiments.

ADDRESS.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Ohio:

GENTLEMEN:—We, the disfranchised Colored Citizens of Ohio, assembled in General Convention, feeling deeply the grievous wrong unjustly inflicted upon us by the prohibitions implied in the first Section of the fifth Article of the Constitution of the State, and knowing "that people have the right to assemble together, in a peaceful manner, to counsel for their common good, and to petition the General Assembly for a redress of grievances," and, believing it to be a solemn duty we owe to ourselves, our posterity, and the honor and dignity of the free State of Ohio, to use every constitutional means which the law-makers of Ohio have left in our hands, to remove from our neck the burdens too grievous to be borne; we do, therefore, most earnestly, in the name of our common humanity, in the name of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights of the State of Ohio, ask your Honorable Body to take the necessary constitutional steps to strike the word "white" from the section before referred to, and all other places in which it occurs in the Constitution, and thereby abrogate the unwise and unjust distinction therein made between the citizens of the State and the citizens of color. The section referred to is couched in the following language: "Art. V, Sec. I. Every white male citizen of the United States, of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of the State one year, shall be entitled to the elective franchise, and of the county, township, or ward in which he resides, such times as may be provided by law, shall have the qualifications of an elector, and be entitled to vote at all elections."

The reason we will assign for the removal of this odious word from the Constitution of a professedly free State, is, that we are MEN. This, to our minds, seems an all-sufficient plea. Human rights are not to be graduated by the shades of color that tinge the cheek of men. Every being, who takes the scale of civilization, that yet preserves the traits that serve to distinguish humanity from the brute, is endowed with all rights that can be claimed by the most cultivated races of men.

That we are men, we will not insult your intelligence by attempting to prove. The most bitter revilers and oppressors of the race admit this, even in the enactments by which they wrong us. Statutes and ordinances are not necessary for the regulation of the conduct of men, but men, reasoning men, who can understand and obey, or plot to overthrow. The section of which we complain, by defining that white men may exercise the right of franchise, virtually admits that there are black men who are by the rule prohibited. Hath not the negro eyes? Hath not the negro hands, organs, dimensions, sense, affections, passions?—fed with the same food—hurt with the same weapons—subject to the same diseases—hunted by the same means—restrained and controlled by the same summer and winter as the white man is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die?

We ask you to ponder the danger of circumventing the great doctrine of human equality, which is the basis of our civilization, and defended at the cost of so much blood and treasure, by the narrow bounds of race or nation. All men are by nature equal, and have inalienable rights, or none have. We beg you to reflect, how insecure your position is, if you should attempt to restrict the rights of men. Another nation or race may displace you, as you have displaced nations and races, and the injustice you teach, they may execute, perchance they may better the construction. Remember, in your pride of race and power, "That we are all children of one Father, and all ye are brethren."

But the principles upon which our Government is founded, condemn the practice of excluding colored men from the advantages of the ballot-box. To uphold the principle that taxation and representation should go together, the union between Great Britain and the American Colonies was broken, and a desolating war of seven years' duration was waged. As proof of the correctness of the principle, we have the declaration and actions of our fathers, and your own declarations. If the sentiment was so true in 1776, what new concatenation of circumstances has arisen to render it false in 1856? None whatever. It is one of those immutable truths that change not with time or circumstances. They are emanations from the eternal foundation of truth, which we all worship—the Deity Himself. Yet, in nearly every county of our State, where tax-payers are found, we are unrepresented, and can only be heard in your halls as a matter of force.—We are aware that difference of race is urged by our enemies as a reason for our disfranchisement; but we submit that we are as Africans, but Americans, as much as any of your population. Here then is a great injustice done us, by refusing to acknowledge our right to the appellation of Americans, which is the only title we desire, and legislating for us as if we were aliens, and not bound to our country by the ties of affection which every human being must feel for his native land; which makes the Lapidarian prefer his snows and skins to the sunny skies and silver garb of Italy; which makes the colored American prefer the dear land of his birth, even though oppressed in it, to any other spot on earth.

But admit, for argument, that there is an irrational difference between us and the white of our land. That very difference unfits them to represent us. Our wants and feelings are unknown or unappreciated by them; nor can any one presume to represent us whom we have not aided to select. In our government, every citizen should be represented in the legislative councils, and this can only be attained by permitting each one a voice in the selection of representatives. No class in the white population would be willing to concede to any other class, however honest and enlightened, the custody of their rights. To demand such a thing would be deemed monstrous; and the injustice is not lessened when the demand is made upon black men instead of white men.

Our want of intelligence is urged as a reason against our admission to equal citizenship. The assumption that we are ignorant is untrue; but, even if it were true, it really affords an argument for the removal of the disabilities that cripple our energies, destroy that feeling of self-respect, so essential to form the character of a good citizen.—Give us the opportunity of elevating ourselves.—It can do us no harm, and may do us much good. If we fail, upon us be the blame. We submit, being to your recollection that, by a decision of your Supreme Court, a large portion of our people are already in the possession of the elective franchise. These men are not above the average of colored men in intelligence or morals.

They are educated under the same depressing social influences with the rest of us, and are no better fitted to exercise the right of voting than their brethren.—Yet, by an accident of color, they are enfranchised. What good reason can be adduced for permitting the father to vote and not the son, or the son and not the father, as is frequently the case? The most obtuse intellect can at once perceive the utter folly and injustice of such distinctions. But the folly and injustice is equally as great when the difference is made between white and colored men. We are aware that it has been recently asserted by a high political personage, that this is a government of white men. This we cannot admit.—In addition to the arguments we have already advanced, touching the doctrine of the universality of human rights, we submit that the assertion exists an imputation upon the veracity and good faith of our fathers, who claimed the sympathy and aid of the world on the ground that they were contending for principles of universal application and desired to found a government in which the doctrine of human equality would be reduced to practice.

The Bill of Rights of the State of Ohio sets forth, "That all men are created equal and independent, and have inalienable rights among which are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and seeking and obtaining happiness and safety." Now, admitted that we are men, how are we to defend and protect life, liberty, and property? One of the duties of the State, through the ballot-box, is to do these things peaceably; but we, by the organic law of the State, are prevented from defending those precious rights by any other than violent means. For the same document that asserts our right to defend life, liberty, and property, strips us of the power to do so otherwise than by violence. We ask you, gentlemen, in the name of justice, shall this stand as the judgement of the State of Ohio?

We are aware that deference to the opinions and instructions of the States tolerating slavery, to whom we are bound by the federal compact, may induce some to oppose this our application for equal rights. But those States, of all others, are the most tenacious of their rights as sovereign States, and the least likely to be swayed by the domestic policy by the action of public opinion in other States. We pray you, therefore to do us justice, and, in doing right, initiate the independence they display in doing wrong. Our rights are as high as theirs, and we demand that we have no right to complain of any act of the people of Ohio, improving the condition of any class of her citizens.

We do not ask you to countenance any change destructive to your form of government, or to the rights of white men to be understood and recognized by the law and good of our own and other lands. It will be but the legitimate result of a proper appreciation of the Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights. Already five States of the Union have admitted the colored man to the vote, and have yet to hear that the action has been followed by any other than beneficial results.

The arguments we have advanced are equally applicable to the statutory enactments which inflict such grievous disabilities upon us as a people. The inestimable privilege and protection of a trial by a jury of our peers, we are deprived of, and to our great damage. Every legal gentleman who defends us, and who is not a hypocrite, and in your body must be aware of the facts, and which convictions are obtained against colored men.

Admission to your infirmaries and other benevolent institutions, is demanded by the spirit of the age. It is a shame to your civilization and humanity that a decrepit age, the helplessly maimed, the blind, the deaf, and the feeble, as has been done in the metropolis of your State. In your public schools, too, needless and injurious distinctions are made. The duty of the State is the same to all her children. None are so insignificant as to be kept in the shadows of inferior schools. The interests of the State demand that all should be educated alike.

In conclusion, we call your attention to the duties incumbent on you as legislators—to pass such laws as will increase the happiness, prosperity and security of the people of the state; to remove all just causes of dissatisfaction.

Many may indulge the hope that the colored population is destined to pass away from your midst, and so refuse our prayer. But the hope is a delusion. We are a part of the American people, and we and our posterity will forever be a constituent part of your population. If we are deprived of education, of equal political privileges, still subjected to the same depressing influences under which we now suffer, the natural consequences will follow; and the State, for her planting of crime, will reap her harvest. She will contain within her limits a discontented population—disaffected, estranged—ready to welcome any revolution or invasion as a relief, for they can lose nothing and gain much. A contrary course of policy will end in a march of improvement, disaffection will cease, and our noble State stand securely defended by the loving hearts of all her sons.

In behalf of the State Convention of colored men.—**PETER H. CLARK, Chas.**

Charles Langston,
Charles H. Yancey,
D. Jenkins,
John Williams,
Solomon Grimes,
Anderson Flinn,
John M. Langston,
John I. Gaines,
L. D. Taylor.

The memorial was received and read, and referred to a select committee consisting of the following gentlemen: Messrs. Canfield, Brown, and Taylor of Georgia.

The Committee on petitions reported the following: We, the undersigned, citizens of — county, respectfully but earnestly petition your honorable body, Ist. To immediately take the necessary constitutional steps to so alter or amend the Constitution of this State as to strike out the word "white" in the first Section of the fifth Article.—2d. To so alter or amend the fifth Section of the fifth Article of the Constitution as to strike out the word "white" in that article. 3d. To alter, to repeal all laws and parts of laws which make distinctions on account of color.

SPECIAL MESSAGE OF GOV. CHASE.
To the General Assembly of the State of Ohio.
I transmit for the consideration of the General Assembly a communication from certain gentlemen holding official positions in Kansas.

The urgency of this appeal, made by the communication herewith transmitted, induces me to lay it before the General Assembly without delay. It is authenticated by the signatures of James Lane, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kansas Territory, of Charles Robinson, the Governor, and George W. Ditzler, the Secretary, elected by the People under the recently adopted State Constitution.

It represents that an overwhelming force of citizens of Missouri are organizing upon the borders of Kansas, with the avowed purpose of invading the Territory, demolishing its towns, and butchering its Free State citizens. It appeals for prompt assistance in terms which cannot fail to command your most earnest attention.

The object of the contemplated invasion of Kansas is to compel its inhabitants to submit to the establishment of slavery.

The progress of slaveholding aggression is very remarkable. In 1820 the slave power insisted on the admission of Missouri as a Slave State, and effected its purpose by engrafting on the bill for its admission a perpetual prohibition of slavery in all the remainder of the territory reserved from France, north of the south line of Missouri, extending westward to our frontier.

In 1854, the slave power demanded the repeal of the Prohibition of 1820, and effected its object by engrafting on the Nebraska bill which provided for the repeal, an express declaration that the people of the Territory should be left "perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions, subject only to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States."

That this proposition would be advanced, foreseen and predicted, when the Nebraska Kansas Bill was under discussion; and it was, indeed, indirectly sanctioned by the refusal of its supporters to adopt an amendment to the bill, expressly recognizing the right of the people to exclude slavery.

Whatever construction, however, may have been intended by the slaveholding supporters of the bill, and whatever consequence to that construction may be added by the phraseology of the act itself, it is certain that, throughout the Free States, the conviction is nearly universal, that the people of Kansas, deprived of the protection of the prohibition of 1820, have, and ought to have, complete right and full power to protect themselves against the evil of Slavery.

To prevent the people from exercising this right and power, armed bands, from the neighboring State of Missouri, invaded the Territory at the time appointed for the first election of members of the Territorial Legislature, (March 30, 1855), and, having taken possession of the polls, and excluded the legal voters, selected the persons who were to constitute the Legislature, without regard to their place of residence, whether in Missouri or Kansas.

This spurious Legislature were worthy of its origin. Having excluded the few Free State members who held certificates of election, they proceeded to promulgate in the forms of law, a series of premeditated statutes which have no parallel in the annals of legislative usurpation. The Governor of the Territory, who attempted, ineffectually, to restrain their excesses by his executive veto, was removed from office by the President of the United States, and thus full scope was given to their utmost extravagance.

At a convened province, they proceeded to declare the establishment of Slavery, and to secure it against popular opposition, by providing for the appointment of Sheriffs and other officers, by Commissioners of their own creation; who are sworn to the people any vote, whatever in their selection, and by imposing on the exercise of the right to vote at future elections of members of the Legislature, conditions with which none but supporters of Slavery could comply.

It is impossible for men, and themselves prepared to be slaves, to admit the validity of this spurious legislation. The people of Kansas refuse to submit to disfranchisement by the usurpers. Left without valid laws, and remitted to the original rights, inalienable by man, they are endeavoring to secure for their safety and good order, they proceed in regular convention, to appoint a day and prescribe the manner of selecting a delegate to Congress, and to provide for holding a convention to frame a constitution, preparatory to application for admission into the Union as a State.

On the 9th of October last, the day designated for the election of a delegate to Congress, Andrew H. Reeder was chosen to that office; and on the 23d of the same month a State Constitution was promulgated by the convention elected for the purpose. On the 15th of December this constitution was ratified by the people, and on the 15th of January, just past, and election was held for State officers and members of the State Legislature. The Governor and Secretary, whose signatures are affixed to the appeal herewith transmitted, were chosen at this election.

While these things were in progress the Territory was again invaded, early in December by armed bands from Missouri, now called into action by an extraordinary proclamation from Wilson Shannon, who had been appointed Governor of the Territory in place of his removed predecessor. The town of Lawrence was actually beleaguered, and its destruction fiercely threatened. The people of the Territory rallied to its defence, and for many days, civil war was imminent. At length, however, the Governor, becoming weary of the error he had committed, and succeeded in inducing the invaders to retire.

Their presence had been marked by outrage, rapine and murder. Their withdrawal was angry and reluctant. It indicated a remission of hostilities.

Hence it is not surprising that the election of State officers under the new Constitution, on the 15th of January, was made the occasion of further hostilities. The Territory was again invaded, and an actual encounter took place between the invaders and the settlers. Some time after its termination, a respected citizen, an emigrant from Kentucky, of the name of Brown, who had been engaged in it upon the Free State side, was seized and inhumanly murdered by the opposite party.

The communication which I transmit, expresses a strong apprehension that preparations are making of implements of destruction for a new invasion more destructive than any which has preceded it. In

formation from other sources confirms the opinion that this apprehension is not groundless.

It is impossible to contemplate these things without deep feeling. They are the legitimate fruits of the repeal of the Missouri Prohibition.—It may not be possible at present to re-establish that prohibition. It is, perhaps, not probable that Congress, as at present constituted, will consent to the admission of Kansas into the Union under her Free State Constitution. The General Assembly of Ohio has, perhaps, no legislative power to redress the wrongs of the people of the Territory; but still something not unimportant, may be done. The Assembly can express the sense of the people of Ohio, in Resolutions addressed to their Senators and Representatives in Congress. They can recommend the admission of Kansas as a Free State, the enactment of a suitable law securing freedom of elections in case the Territorial government be not superseded; and what perhaps is of more importance still, the prompt admission of the People of the Territory to a seat in Congress, that they may have the most favorable opportunity of gaining the attention of the National Legislature to their wants and their wrongs. The General Assembly may also, by suitable resolutions, commend the cause of Kansas to the warm sympathies and liberal contributions of their constituents. They will not, I am sure, invoke the prompt action of the people in vain.

Having thus performed what seemed to me to be my duty, in transmitting to you the communication from the popular authorities in Kansas, with such observations as the occasion appeared to demand, I cheerfully submit the whole matter to the superior wisdom of the General Assembly.

S. F. CHASE,

LAWRENCE CITY, K. T.,

January 21st, 1856.

To His Excellency, the Governor of Ohio:

Sir: We have authentic information that an overwhelming force of the citizens of Missouri are organizing upon our border amply supplied with artillery, for the avowed purpose of invading our Territory, demolishing our towns, and butchering our unoffending Free State citizens.

We hope to be able to hold out until assistance can reach us. We respectfully request, on behalf of the citizens of Kansas, that such steps may be taken by the people of the State as humanity suggests to prevent the successful carrying out of so inhuman an outrage.

Respectfully,

J. M. LANE,

Chairman, Ex. Com. K. T.

C. ROBINSON,

Governor elect of Kansas.

GEO. DITZLER,

Secretary.

From the Wesleyan.

METHODIST SLAVE-TRADERS.

There are many persons in the Methodist Episcopal Church, who, like Dr. Eliot, who told the slaveholders that no member now sells a slave without being disciplined—losing his membership. Now for facts:

In Brooklyn, N. Y., my native county, B. H. member of the M. E. Church, sold a slave woman and children a few years since—since the division. This woman, with her children, had been sold to him, and committed no offence—he wanted money and sold them.

Another member, G. A., last winter cast two unfortunates slaves in prison, at the death of his wife, by whom he received them, and in a short time sold them. When I left that county, some two or three months since, as I was assured by reliable persons, that slave-trading was, as before, a member, in good standing—undisciplined. So was the member I first alluded to. I have talked with him about his sin in this respect. My wife says, if one of our uncles T. H.—was now living, he would come fifteen months since, he would testify that another member, who was still in good standing last fall—a leading man, sold him a slave, since the division in 1844. These facts are notorious; and whilst in Campbell Co., last fall, I was assured that there are many other like examples.

But why should our Methodist brethren make the absence of slave-trading the standard of their piety, or loyalty to freedom and righteousness? The crime consists not in the selling, but in the holding—keeping in chattel slavery. If I have a right to hold a horse, then I may rightfully sell him. The crime is in holding a slave. So the M. E. Church once decided; and forty years since, even in Ky., as I learn from a living witness, in that very church conference, at Louisville, Ky., it was decided that a member who would not pledge himself to manumit some slaves then in his possession. In those days, there was much piety and efficiency in that Church, now but little, if any, of either. The line gold has become dim. Slavery has been suffered to come in, and with it pride, caste, and oppression. These have grieved away the spirit of God, and dissipated love for souls.

There is no safety, Bro. Matlack, but in obedience to the divine commands "not to mix with the ungodly," "have no fellowship with the unfruitful work of darkness;" "come out of her my people, that be ye not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

JOHN G. FEE,

Barren, Madison Co., Jan. 11, '56.

From the Cincinnati Gazette.

THE CINCINNATI SLAVE CASE.

BEFORE U. S. COMMISSIONER PENDERLY.

SPEECH OF MR. JOLIFE.

On the opening of the Court on Wednesday morning Mr. Joliffe commenced his argument.—He said: I have reason to rejoice to-day in behalf of my clients and of the country, that this case is to be tried before a gentleman who has tried similar cases, and had the moral courage to decide against the claimant. It was not the pride of opinion that controlled his judgment, but a sincere conviction of the truth and justice of such a course.

I will not notice the arguments of my courteous opponent, Mr. Fennell. He said Kentucky and Virginia were not responsible for Slavery, but the Yankees, who sold them the negroes. Others have charged that England forced Slavery upon us, when King George's army was sent down to Norfolk to buy slaves, were they not to be blamed? The merchants and traders sold them for gold—for gold they would have sold the planters as well. But were not they who tempted the merchants to bring their slaves, equally guilty with those who bought them?

He said, also, that it was the Abolitionists who were creating all this agitation, and he denounced them as "pot-house politicians." Now, who are the Abolitionists? Now those in Ohio, perhaps, as well as that gentleman, but I do not know among them a single man to whom the phrase, "pot-house politicians," could be applied.

The gentleman was ill-advised in his attack.—He was firing his grape and canister into the ranks of his allies, and at every charge they fell. The Union-savers, they are the pot-house politicians—men who love everything but God and the poor—for the meaner and more degraded a white man is, the more he hates a negro. He further charged us with being ungrateful to Kentucky, who assisted to fight our battles in the Northwest. When Kentucky renders any service to the Union, she as a State, claims credit for it; but when sacrifices

are expected from Ohio, we are to make them entirely for the sake of the Union.

But we do return the kindness. When a poor and friendless Kentuckian comes here naked, we clothe him; hungry, we feed him; we relieve him; bound on a journey, we put him on a certain railroad and have him through in lightning speed.—If Kentucky feels aggrieved, let her ladies retaliate. Let them set up sewing societies for the poor Ohioans, and as hospitable Kentucky is better than pious Ohio, let them send ten for one of our people to Texas, Kansas, or any other place as they desire to emigrate. (Applause and cries of order.)

No, poor Kentuckians, even the most destitute, find friends and counsel here. For all this, however, on both sides of this case, are Kentuckians.—The only difference between them is that while they (looking towards the slaves) are heroically struggling for freedom, that man (looking at Mr. Marshall) comes into Court, his hands all red with warm blood, and asks to take the father of that murdered infant back into interminable slavery and the grandfather back into everlasting bondage. (Applause, and cries of order.)

But the gentleman says the Constitution of the U. S. gives him a right to these fugitives. Oh, star-eyed science, hast thou wandered there? To bring us back the message of despair?

That a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, is an axiom. The proposition on which I shall base my argument is no less plain. It is: That every man on earth has the right to do every thing that God has made it his duty to do, or, as I can not here as a theologian to discuss difficult points, but only as a citizen asserting rights, and as some duties are more clearly stated in the Bible than others, I will vary the form, and say: That every man on earth has the right to do everything that God, in the Bible, has clearly made it his duty to do.

God made it the duty of Daniel to pray, though the Persian Empire forbid it—of the three lovely children to refuse to bow down before an idol—of the Apostles to preach the doctrine of the resurrection—of Cranmer and Ridley to refuse to bow down to the sacrifice of the Mass—and in doing so they all assert their right. Right and duty are correlative terms, as inseparably mingled as the light and heat of the sun. Sir, to the Commissioner of the U. S., to love God with all your heart and your neighbor as yourself. It is your right to keep a conscience void of offence. This is a right for which the martyrs suffered, and for which our fathers poured out their blood like water—the right of every American citizen to take the Bible as the man of his council. You have a right to love that old man, (putting his hand on the head of old Simon), as you love yourself, and to do to him as you would have him do to you, and it is your duty, sitting here in the temple of Justice, to exercise that right.

Your oath to support the Constitution imposes an obligation to support it all, not only the 3d article of the IV section, but the whole Constitution.

The Constitution says (1st Amendment) "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This may embrace the religion of China and of the Hindus, but it certainly does embrace the Christian religion. What then is the Christian religion? It is the vital principle in love the Bible, your heart, and your neighbor as yourself, and every law that interferes with this as do the acts "33 and 50) pierces the very vitals of the Christian religion as the spear of the Roman soldier pierced the heart of Christ on the cross. Should Congress pass a law forbidding you to read the Bible, does any man doubt that it would be unconstitutional? When Congress passes a law forbidding you to obey the Bible, is not that unconstitutional? What binding force would a law have declaring that there is no God? How much better is an act which says there is a God, than you shall not obey him? The Bible commands to feed the hungry—clothe the naked—shelter the outcast—to break every yoke and let the oppressed go free. The Abolitionists—the lawless, blood-spreading—have for the last 25 years been asserting these rights, unconsciously hearing upon their own shoulders the rights of the whole American people.

A few years ago all Christendom were indignant because the Madrid fair were imprisoned for reading the Bible. But what difference is there between imprisoning a man for reading the Bible in Italy, and for obeying it in the United States? All men have a religion, no matter whether members of churches or not—deep down the heart of every man, is a sense of responsibility to his maker. It may not show itself called to do some gigantic wrong, but then it rises up to restrain his hand.

When called upon to decide upon a question like this, it is your duty to listen to his voice. That man (putting his hand on young Simon) is here a prisoner, guilty of no crime, his wife in jail in a delicate situation, needing her husband's aid, and Mr. Marshall asks you to tear him from his wife's arms. His three children, one an infant at the breast demand his care, and you are asked to tear him from both wife and children, to sell his flesh, blood and bones, and send on a certain blockade-bound steamer, your countryman, to interfere with that? Can you do it and keep your conscience void of offence? Can you do it and maintain for the people of the U. S. the right of religious freedom?

When we consider the great question of religious liberty, we must remember that the right to become insignificant. It is your right and mine. Never in the history of jurisprudence has a question of such importance been submitted to the decision of a single man. If you sustain these rights, you sustain religious freedom for us all; if not, you betray humanity.

He then considered the rules of construction by which this Article of the Constitution was to be interpreted, and the purpose for which it was made. Now, said he, if Congress cannot pass a law compelling you to worship God, can they pass a law compelling you to sin against God?

The trouble is this. The Congress of the United States have endeavored to pass a law declaring that wrong was right. There is danger in this dangerous right, for every law that supports slavery